

Applic. No. 10/635,584  
Amdt. dated August 16, 2004  
Reply to Office action of May 17, 2004

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-15 are now in the application. Claims 1, 12, and 13 have been amended. Claims 14 and 15 have been added, support for which can be found on page 8, lines 6-8 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1-11 and 13 have been objected to because on line 8 of claim 1 and line 5 of claim 13, it appears that "said inner panel" should be "said front panel". Claims 1 and 13 have been amended so as to facilitate prosecution of the application. Therefore, the objection to claims 1-11 and 13 by the Examiner is believed to have been overcome.

Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which the matter may be resolved. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided solely for cosmetic or clarificatory reasons. The changes are not provided for overcoming the prior art nor for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

Applic. No. 10/635,584  
Amdt. dated August 16, 2004  
Reply to Office action of May 17, 2004

In the fourth paragraph on page 2 of the Office action, claims 1-3, 12, and 13 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Getman (U.S. Patent No. 3,189,020) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found on page 8, lines 6-18 of the specification.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claims 1, 12, and 13 call for, *inter alia*:

at least one pan-shaped inner panel consisting essentially of non-metallic material and having a peripheral border, and retaining elements disposed on the inside of the front panel within the peripheral border of the inner panel.

The Getman reference discloses an oven door with a floating inner panel. The oven door (14) is of sheet metal construction having three main elements, an outer door element (30), an

Applic. No. 10/635,584  
Amdt. dated August 16, 2004  
Reply to Office action of May 17, 2004

inner door liner (31) and a floating inner panel (32) (column 3, lines 40-43).

The Getman reference does not show at least one pan-shaped inner panel consisting essentially of non-metallic material and having a peripheral border, as recited in claims 1, 12, and 13 of the instant application. Getman discloses a floating inner panel made of sheet metal. The Getman reference does not disclose that the floating inner panel consists essentially of non-metallic material. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which at least one pan-shaped inner panel consists essentially of non-metallic material and has a peripheral border.

Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Getman, dependent claims 2 and 3 are believed to be allowable over Getman as well.

In the third paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, claims 1 and 7 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Bienick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,558,596) (hereinafter "Bienick") under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Applic. No. 10/635,584  
Amdt. dated August 16, 2004  
Reply to Office action of May 17, 2004

The Bienick reference discloses an oven door outer shell (10), which is united to a conventional metal oven inner doorframe assembly (9), of a conventional construction (column 6, lines 27-31). Bienick discloses that the inner frame (9) includes an inner polygonal annular frame (33) having four generally hollow legs (32) for fastening the frame assembly (9) to the outer shell (10).

Bienick does not show at least one pan-shaped inner panel consisting essentially of non-metallic material and having a peripheral border, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. Bienick discloses a conventional metal oven inner doorframe assembly (9). The Bienick reference does not disclose that the inner oven doorframe assembly consists essentially of non-metallic material. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which at least one pan-shaped inner panel consists essentially of non-metallic material and has a peripheral border.

Furthermore, Bienick does not show retaining elements disposed on the inside of the front panel within the peripheral border of the inner panel, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. The Bienick reference discloses that frame (9) has four generally hollow legs (32) for fastening the frame assembly (9) to the outer shell (10). The hollow legs (32) of

Applic. No. 10/635,584  
Amdt. dated August 16, 2004  
Reply to Office action of May 17, 2004

Bienick are not within the peripheral border of the inner panel. Bienick does not disclose that retaining elements are disposed within the peripheral border of the inner panel. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which retaining elements are disposed on the inside of the front panel within the peripheral border of the inner panel.

Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Bienick, dependent claim 7 is also believed to be allowable over Bienick as well.

In the last paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, claim 4 has been rejected as being obvious over Lafforgue (U.S. Patent No. 3,507,267) in view of Getman (U.S. Patent No. 3,189,020) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Lafforgue does not make up for the deficiencies of Getman. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claim 4 is believed to be allowable as well.

In the fourth paragraph on page 4 of the Office action, claims 5 and 6 have been rejected as being obvious over Getman (U.S. Patent No. 3,189,020) in view of Bonaccorsi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,716,884) (hereinafter "Bonaccorsi") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Bonaccorsi does not make up for the

Applic. No. 10/635,584  
Amdt. dated August 16, 2004  
Reply to Office action of May 17, 2004

deficiencies of Getman. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 5 and 6 are believed to be allowable as well.

In the last paragraph on page 4 of the Office action, claims 9 and 10 have been rejected as being obvious over Getman (U.S. Patent No. 3,189,020) in view of Winkler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,396,717) (hereinafter "Winkler") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Winkler does not make up for the deficiencies of Getman. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 9 and 10 are believed to be allowable as well.

In the third paragraph on page 5 of the Office action, claim 11 has been rejected as being obvious over Getman (U.S. Patent No. 3,189,020) in view of Chase et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,612,825) (hereinafter "Chase") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Chase does not make up for the deficiencies of Getman. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claim 11 is believed to be allowable as well.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1, 12, or 13. Claims 1, 12, and 13 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately

Applic. No. 10/635,584  
Amdt. dated August 16, 2004  
Reply to Office action of May 17, 2004

dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-14 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner & Greenberg P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
For Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler  
52,794

AKD:cgm

August 17, 2004

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101